



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/000,170	11/30/2001	Peter Zatloukal	41051.P010	9518
25943	7590	10/20/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204			TRUONG, THANHNGA B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

10/000170

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

101706

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

A supplement Examiner's Answer is attached herein to include all conferees initials.

T. B. Truong
AU 2135



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED
OCT 20 2006
Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/000,170
Filing Date: November 30, 2001
Appellant(s): ZATLOUKAL ET AL.

Robert C. Peck
For Appellant

Supplemental
EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 15, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed January 12, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is incorrect.

The amendment after final rejection filed on February 22, 2006 has been entered.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct. However, the new ground(s) of rejection is modified herein:

1. Claims 1, 17-20, 36, 52-55, 73-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lam et al (US 6,747,578 B1).
2. Claims 2-7, 10-11, 13-16, 21-26, 29-32, 34-35, 37-42, 45-46, 48-51, 60-65, 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam et al (US 6,747,578 B1), and further in view of Reed, III et al (US 5,153,919).
3. Claims 8-9, 27-28, 43-44, 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam et al (US 6,747,578 B1), further in view of Reed, III et al (US 5,153,919), and further in view of Chen et al (US 5,784,463).
4. Claims 12, 33, 47, and 72 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 6, 747, 578	Lam et al	June 8, 2004
US 5, 153, 919	Reed, III et al	October 6, 1992
US 5, 784, 463	Chen et al	July 21, 1998

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1, 17-20, 36, 52-55, 73-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lam et al (US 6,747,578 B1).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Lam teaches:

(1) detecting for presence of a removably attached interchangeable cover [i.e., a faceplate for an electronic device comprising: a housing adapted to be removably secured onto the electronic device; a plurality of electrical contacts disposed on the housing and operable to mate with corresponding electrical contacts of the electronic device when the housing is secured onto the electronic device; and a plurality of buttons disposed on the housing and, when activated, for causing signals to be generated over the electrical contacts indicating which buttons were activated and when activated (column 3, lines 25-40)];

(2) authenticating the removably attached interchangeable cover as an eligible cover [i.e., an identification unit disposed on the housing and coupled to the electrical contacts of the faceplate, the identification unit for identifying the faceplate to the electronic device (column 3, lines 40-45)]; and

(3) operating the electronic apparatus, enabling/disabling all or selected functions/features offered by the base portion and the removably attached interchangeable cover in view of whether the removably attached

Art Unit: 2135

interchangeable cover is authenticated (or accepted) [i.e., the faceplate keys 270, in accordance with the present invention, may be placed in any location and are not limited in position to the locations of any keys that are integrated on device 100a (if any). In the example shown in Figure 4, the device 100a does not have any keys on its face. The front side of faceplate 250 illustrates a cut-out region 260 for positioning around display 105. When attached to the device 100a, contacts (not shown) on the rear side of the faceplate 250 will come into physical contact with electrical pads 220 located on the device 100a. In this way, the faceplate 250 may communicate with the electronics of device 100a. It is appreciated that the exterior of device 100a may include a recess of roughly the same area and size as the faceplate 250 and this recess may be used to accept the faceplate 250 therein. In this way, the overall size of the PDA with the attached faceplate is reduced and the faceplate 250 becomes integrated with the PDA 100a (column 7, lines 25-42)].

b. Referring to claims 19-20, 54-55:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

c. Referring to claim 36:

i. Lam teaches:

(1) a base body case [i.e., Figure 4 illustrates a perspective view of a faceplate 250, in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention, and also a portable computer system 100a adapted to receive the faceplate 250. In one embodiment, the faceplate 250 is removably attached to device 100a by pressure and by snap fitting hooks and mechanisms. In this way, the faceplate 250 can readily be removed from device 100a and replaced (column 7, lines 15-25)];

(2) a processor encased within said base body case for use to execute instructions [i.e., the faceplate 250a is a housing that contains multiple standard buttons 270 for PDA access, e.g., six buttons are shown. This

faceplate 250a is contemplated as being a basic or base faceplate that would be shipped with the PDA 100a. Not shown are internal electrical contacts on the rear side of the faceplate 250a that make contact with corresponding electrical contacts of the front side of device 100a when the two components are snapped together. These contacts 222 are shown in Figure 7. In the embodiment of Figure 5A, user selections of buttons 270 are translated into coded signals which are generated over the electrical contacts and processed by device 100a. Using these coded signals, the device 100a can determine which buttons were pressed and when (column 7, lines 48-60), wherein the device 100a is a portable computer system, which includes an address/data bus 99 for communicating information, a central processor 101 coupled with the bus 99 for processing information and instructions, a volatile memory 102 (e.g., random access memory RAM) coupled with the bus 99 for storing information and instructions for the central processor 101 and a non-volatile memory 103 (e.g., read only memory ROM) coupled with the bus 99 for storing static information and instructions for the processor 101 (column 5, lines 6-14)];

(3) storage medium encased within said base body case, coupled to said processor, and having stored therein a plurality of instructions designed to implement a plurality of functions/features, to authenticate a removably attached smart interchangeable cover attached to the base body case as an eligible cover, and to operate the electronic apparatus, enabling/disabling all or selected ones of the implemented functions/features and functions/features offered by the removably attached smart interchangeable cover consistent with whether the removably attached smart interchangeable cover is authenticated [i.e., the device 100a is a portable computer system, which includes an address/data bus 99 for communicating information, a central processor 101 coupled with the bus 99 for processing information and instructions, a volatile memory 102 (e.g., random access memory RAM) coupled with the bus 99 for storing information and instructions for the central processor 101 and a non-volatile memory 103 (e.g., read only memory

Art Unit: 2135

ROM) coupled with the bus 99 for storing static information and instructions for the processor 101 (column 5, lines 6-14). Further limitations that are similar to those of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above].

d. Referring to claims 56-59; 75-77:

i. Lam further teaches:

(1) wherein said apparatus is a wireless communication device; wherein wireless communication device is a wireless mobile phone; wherein said electronic apparatus is a selected one of a personal digital assistant and an electronic gaming device [i.e., in addition to device 108, wireless communication links can be established between the device 100 and a host computer system (or another portable computer system) using a Bluetooth wireless device 360, an infrared device 355, a GSM radio device 240, or a CDMA device, or a W-CDMA device or a 802.11 device. Device 100 may also include a wireless modem device 240 and/or a wireless radio, e.g., a GSM wireless radio with supporting chipset. The wireless modem device 240 is coupled to communicate with the processor 101 but may not be directly coupled to port 108 (column 6, lines 3-13). Furthermore, referring to Figure 13, other functionality that could be added by unit 480 includes an expansion module connector or bus that is adapted for receiving standard sized electronic modules. Also possible are wireless communication devices, such as Bluetooth modules, IR modules, etc. The unit 480 could also be an expanded display screen. An such device would be coupled to contacts 222. According to the various embodiments of the present invention, the electrical contacts 222 may carry a number of different signal types. For instance, some contacts may be reserved for key code information relating to the buttons that were pressed. In addition, two contacts may be reserved to supplying auxiliary power to the device 100a. Also, various contacts may be reserved for supplying an identification code to device 100a to indicate the faceplate type, e.g., standard PDA type, extended keyboard type, gaming type,

Art Unit: 2135

GPS type, music type, etc. Other contacts can be reserved for supplying data signals (analog or digital) to device 100a (column 10, lines 50-670). Embodiments of Lam's invention provide an electronic device, e.g., a cell phone, portable computer system, PDA, electronic pager, etc., having a removable functional faceplate. The removable functional faceplate provides additional keys and key functionality that are in addition to any underlying keys of the electronic device (if it has any at all) (column 2, lines 22-29)].

e. Referring to claim 59:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 36, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 36 above.

f. Referring to claims 17, 34, 52, 73:

i. Lam further teaches:

(1) wherein said method further comprises requesting and receiving implementing instructions/data of a personalization feature from the removably attached interchangeable cover to personalize the electronic apparatus [i.e., by providing the ability to add new keys to the faceplate, the present invention provides an electronic device that may be substantially customized for a particular user or for a particular and specialized use (column 2, lines 40-44)].

g. Referring to claims 18, 35, 53, 74:

i. Lam further teaches:

(1) wherein said method further comprises requesting and receiving implementing instructions/data of a function from the removably attached interchangeable cover to enrich the functions of the electronic apparatus [i.e., the removable functional faceplate provides additional keys and key functionality that are in addition to any underlying keys of the electronic device (if it has any at all). For instance, removable faceplates can add extended keyboards, gaming controls, etc. The new keys and key functionality can be placed in any location on the faceplate and may be of any key type without restriction to the underlying

keys of the electronic device (if it has any at all). Additionally, the functional faceplates may provide circuits which add functionality to the electronic device other than, or in addition to, new keys, e.g., increased memory capacity, increased power capacity, music playing capacity, measurement devices, etc. The faceplates are removable, and in one embodiment, designed to be readily removed and installed by the user (column 2, lines 26-40)].

2. Claims 2-7, 10-11, 13-16, 21-26, 29-32, 37-42, 45-46, 48-51, 60-65, 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam et al (US 6,747,578 B1), and further in view of Reed, III et al (US 5,153,919).

a. Referring to claim 2:

i. Lam further teaches:

(1) generating a first challenge; providing said first challenge to said removably attached interchangeable cover; receiving from the removably attached interchangeable cover a first response to the first challenge; and verifying correctness of said received first response [i.e., The code generator device 410 is disposed on housing 420 is connected to electrical contacts 222 via ribbon cable ("flex circuits") 430c. As discussed above, contacts 222 are operable to come into physical contact with electrical pads 220 of device 100a when faceplate 250a is attached to device 100a. The code generator 410 is responsive to signals from cables 430a and 430b which indicate which button is pressed and when. The code generator 410 is capable of generating a unique digital or analog signal (button code) over contacts 222 indicating which button was pressed. It is appreciated that the button code is generated over contacts 222 simultaneously with the button being pressed. It is appreciated that many well known code generators could be used for this function, including numerous different types of digital and/or analog code generators (column 8, lines 40-54)].

ii. Although Lam teaches the claimed subject matter, Lam does not clearly mentioned that the code generator could generate the challenge. On the other hand, Reed III teaches the generation of the challenge. This limitation is met on

Art Unit: 2135

column 6, lines 37-67 of Reed III and column 1, lines 51-67 through column 2, lines 1-3 and lines 34-40.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) combine the teaching of Reed III into Lam's system for insuring validity of communicating radio-telephones and the like (**column 1, lines 7-8 of Reed III**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) combine the teaching of Reed III into Lam's system since there is a clear and present need for effective security measures in the cellular telephony art, and that suggests the use of cryptology for the purposes of ensuring authentication and privacy (**column 1, lines 47-50 of Reed III**).

b. Referring to claim 3:

i. Reed III further teaches:

(1) wherein said providing comprises providing said first challenge in a first encrypted form, and said authenticating further comprises encrypting said first challenge into said first encrypted form using a set of one or more session keys [i.e., when party A wishes to communicate with party B, it sends to authentication server AS his own name, the name of party B and a transaction identifier. Server AS returns the name of party B, a session key, the transaction identifier and a message encrypted with B's key. All that information is encrypted with A's key. Party A receives the information, decrypts it, selects the portion that is encrypted with B's key and forwards that portion to party B. Party B decrypts the received messages and find it the name of party A and the session key. A last check (to prevent "replays") is made by party B issuing a challenge to party A and party A replies, using the session key. A match found at party B authenticates the identity of party (column 2, lines 59-67 through column 3, lines 1-5 of Reed III)].

c. Referring to claim 4:

i. Reed III further teaches:

(1) generating said set of one or more session keys (i.e., shared secret data field), and pre-providing said generated set of one or more session keys to said removably attached interchangeable cover [i.e., **the security needs of cellular telephony are met with an arrangement that depends on a shared secret data field. The mobile unit maintains a secret that is assigned to it by the service provider, and generates a shared secret data field from that secret. The service provider also generates the shared secret data field. When a mobile unit enters the cell of a base station, it identifies itself to the base station, and supplies to the base station a hashed authentication string (column 3, lines 7-16 of Reed III)]].**

d. Referring to claim 5:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 3, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

e. Referring to claim 6:

i. Reed III further teaches:

(1) requesting and receiving said public key of the removably attached interchangeable cover from the removably attached interchangeable cover [i.e., **public key cryptography provides another standard class of ways for solving authentication problems. Generally speaking, each mobile station would be provided with a "public key certificate" of identity, signed by the public key of the service provider, stating that the mobile station is a legitimate customer of the service provider (column 2, lines 17-23 of Reed III).**

f. Referring to claim 7:

i. Reed III further teaches:

(1) wherein said receiving of said public key of the removably attached interchangeable cover from the removably attached interchangeable cover comprises receiving said public key of the removably attached interchangeable cover in a signed form from the removably attached interchangeable cover, and said authenticating further comprises verifying said received public key as

having been signed by an authorized party using a public signing key of a trusted certification authority [i.e., public key cryptography provides another standard class of ways for solving authentication problems. Generally speaking, each mobile station would be provided with a "public key certificate" of identity, signed by the public key of the service provider, stating that the mobile station is a legitimate customer of the service provider. In addition, each mobile would also be given secret data (private keys) which it can use, together with the certificate, to prove to third parties (such as the serving system) that it is a legitimate customer (column 2, lines 17-27 of Reed III)].

g. Referring to claim 11:

i. Reed III further teaches:

(1) wherein said first challenge comprises a challenge to provide the base portion with a data block and a signature of the data block, said first response comprises the data block and the corresponding signature requested, and said verification comprises verifying correspondence of the provided data block to the provided signature using a public signing key corresponding to a private signing key employed to generate the signature of the data block [i.e., the Jumble process can create a "signature" of a block of d "secret" data words $b(i)$, with the aid of a k-word key $x(j)$, where d, i, j, and k are integers. The "signature" creation process is carried out on one data word at a time. For purposes of this description, the words on which the Jumble process operates are 8 bits long (providing a range from 0 to 255, inclusive), but any other word size can be employed. The "secret" data block length is incorporated in the saw tooth function. In addition, It may be appreciated that in the process just described there is no real distinction between the data and the key. Therefore, any string that is used for authentication can have a portion thereof used as a key for the above process. Conversely, the data words concatenated with the key can be considered to be the "authentication string". It may also be noted that each word $b(i)$, where $0 \leq i \leq d$ is hashed individually, one at a time, which makes the hashing "in place". No additional

Art Unit: 2135

buffers are needed for the hashing process per se (column 5, lines 26-64 of Reed III)].

h. Referring to claims 13, 30, 48, 69:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 11, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

i. Referring to claims 14-15:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 2, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

j. Referring to claim 16:

i. This claim has some limitations that is similar to those of claim 11, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 11-13 above.

In addition, Reed III further teaches:

(1) said verification of the second response comprises generating a compare hash value for each of the at least one functions/features of the removably attached interchangeable cover provided, and comparing each of the generated compare hash values to the corresponding hash value previously provided as part of the signed manifest [i.e., when a cellular telephone first enters the jurisdiction of a base station, it registers itself with the base station by concatenating a secret password and the most recently broadcast random number, along with other information, and passing the concatenated information to a hash function. The cellular telephone then sends the output of the hash function, along with other identifying information to the service provider. The service provider, upon learning of the cellular telephone's identity, feeds the secret assigned to that cellular telephone and the random number, along with other information, into the same hash function. When the result of the hashing performed by the service provider matches that provided by the cellular telephone, authentication for that cellular telephone is complete (see abstract)].

k. Referring to claims 21, 31-32, 37, 49-50, 60, 70-71:

Art Unit: 2135

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 2, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

l. Referring to claims 22, 38, 61:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 3, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

m. Referring to claims 23, 62:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 4, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

n. Referring to claims 24, 39-40, 63:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 5, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

o. Referring to claims 25-26, 64-65:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claims 6 and 7, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 6 and 7 above.

p. Referring to claims 29, 68:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 11, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

q. Referring to claim 51:

i. This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 16, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 16 above.

r. Referring to claim 41:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 6, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 6 above.

s. Referring to claims 10, 42, 45:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 7, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 7 above.

t. Referring to claim 46:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 11, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

u. Referring to claim 34:

i. Lam further teaches:

(1) wherein said method further comprises requesting and receiving implementing instructions/data of a personalization feature from the removably attached interchangeable cover to personalize the electronic apparatus **[i.e., by providing the ability to add new keys to the faceplate, the present invention provides an electronic device that may be substantially customized for a particular user or for a particular and specialized use (column 2, lines 40-44)]**.

v. Referring to claim 35:

i. Lam further teaches:

(1) wherein said method further comprises requesting and receiving implementing instructions/data of a function from the removably attached interchangeable cover to enrich the functions of the electronic apparatus **[i.e., the removable functional faceplate provides additional keys and key functionality that are in addition to any underlying keys of the electronic device (if it has any at all). For instance, removable faceplates can add extended keyboards, gaming controls, etc. The new keys and key functionality can be placed in any location on the faceplate and may be of any key type without restriction to the underlying keys of the electronic device (if it has any at all). Additionally, the functional faceplates may provide circuits which add functionality to the electronic device other than, or in addition to, new keys, e.g., increased memory capacity, increased power capacity, music playing capacity, measurement devices, etc. The faceplates are removable, and in one embodiment, designed to be readily removed and installed by the user (column 2, lines 26-40)]**.

3. Claims 8-9, 27-28, 43-44, 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam et al (US 6,747,578 B1), further in view of Reed, III et al (US 5,153,919), and further in view of Chen et al (US 5,784,463).

a. Referring to claim 8:

i. Lam and Reed III teach the claimed subject matter; and Reed III further teaches:

(1) wherein said verification of said received public key of the removably attached interchangeable cover as having been signed by an authorized party further comprises determining whether the public signing key has been revoked by the trusted certification authoring, and recovering said public key of the removably attached interchangeable cover as part of the verification process **[i.e., Reed III's Figure 2 depicts the process for directing the creation of a shared secret data field and the verification of same]**.

ii. However, the combination of Lam and Reed II does not explicitly mention about the revoking and/or recovering public key in its verification process. On the other hand, Chen teaches:

(1) The server public key is used to encrypt a client-generated portion of the shared secret key, and the encrypted client-generated key is sent to the server where it is recovered using a private key held by the server and combined with a server generated portion of the shared secret key to form the shared secret key **(see abstract of Chen)**.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) combine the teaching of Chen into Lam's system (as modified) for securing a computer system from unauthorized access over an open or public network to which the computer is connected **(column 1, lines 9-11 of Chen)**.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) combine the teaching of Chen into Lam's system (as modified) for providing a secure yet economical key distribution system (**column 3, lines 45-46 of Chen**).

b. Referring to claim 9:

i. Lam further teaches:

(1) wherein the base portion of the electronic apparatus and the removably attached interchangeable cover are manufactured by a first and a second manufacturer respectively [*i.e., accordingly, Lam's invention provide an electronic device, e.g., a cell phone, portable computer system, PDA, electronic pager, etc., having a removable functional faceplate, wherein the manufacturer is not clearly shown. However, all electronic devices must be made/designed by some kinds of manufacturers so that customers can return the merchandise to the manufacturer if the device is defected/malfunctioned (column 2, lines 22-26)*], and said trusted certification authority is a common licensor licensing respective manufacturing rights to said first and second manufacturers.

ii. Although Lam and Reed III teach the claimed subject matter teaches the claimed subject matter, they do not clearly mentioned that the certification authority is a common licensor. On the other hand, Chen teaches:

(1) The server public key is itself distributed to the user in a secure manner, by transmitting it to the user at the time of registration in the form of a certificate signed by the token issuer or a certification authority and verifiable by a public key embedded in the token prior to distribution. Since the certificate is signed using a private key known only to the token issuer or token certifier, the client software can ensure that the server public key has been authorized by the token issuer or certifier (**column 3, lines 30-40 of Chen**).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

Art Unit: 2135

(1) combine the teaching of Chen into Lam's system (as modified) for securing a computer system from unauthorized access over an open or public network to which the computer is connected (**column 1, lines 9-11 of Chen**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) combine the teaching of Chen into Lam's system (as modified) for providing a secure yet economical key distribution system (**column 3, lines 45-46 of Chen**).

c. Referring to claims 27, 44, 66:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 9, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 9 above.

d. Referring to claims 28, 67:

i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 26, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 26 above.

e. Referring to claim 43:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 8, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

(10) Response to Arguments

I. Regarding to the Appellant's arguments to claims 1 that Lam fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, any sort of eligibility authentication process to determine whether the detected faceplate is eligible for use with the portable computer system. The identification taught by Lam simply does not equate to authentication using the identification signal sent. While an identification signal may well be used for authentication, no authentication process is even hinted at by Lam, and the mere receipt of an identification signal and its use in processing faceplate signals requires no authentication operation. Further, nowhere does Lam mention any sort of processing of the identification information to determine whether the faceplate is of the sort considered "eligible." (**see Appeal Brief, page 7, last paragraph**). Examiner disagrees with the appellant for the above argument, since appellant cited "authenticating the

Art Unit: 2135

removably attached interchangeable cover as an eligible cover". Examiner interprets the broader term "authenticating" that appellant recites in claim 1 as indicating or identifying the right and/or correct faceplate to be used as an "eligible" cover. The identification unit in Lam's system, in fact, identifies on the functional faceplate by accepting the identification code (as shown in Figure 9 of Lam's system) as part of the authenticating process to establish the identity, or ascertain the origin, nature, or definitive characteristics of the eligible cover of the faceplate. Furthermore, Figure 9 of Lam's system shows that identification code device 450 is coupled to an electrical contact 222 and is able to communicate a code to device 100a indicating the identity or type of faceplate that it is. The identity code can help the device 100a to interpret the coded signals generated by the code generator 410. Using the identification code 450, each faceplate adapted for coupling with the device 100a would have its own ID code value. In one embodiment, identification code 450 can be realized using a programmed memory cell (column 9, lines 32-41 of Lam). Thus, Lam teaches the claimed "authenticating the removably attached interchangeable cover as an eligible cover". Hence Lam teaches the claimed subject matter.

Claims 36 and 59 cited similar limitation to that of claim 1. Therefore, the same response to argument above is applied to claims 36 and 59. Hence Lam teaches the claimed subject matter.

II. Regarding to the Appellant's arguments that the rejections of claims 2-7, 10-11, 13-16, 21-26, 29-33, 37-42, 45-46, 48-51, 60-65, and 68-72 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) were improper because Lam and Reeds, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention when the invention as claimed in claims 2-7, 10-11, 13-16, 21-26, 29-33, 37-42, 45-46, 48-51, 60-65, and 68-72 is viewed as a whole. According to the above response to argument, Lam teaches the claimed subject matter of claims 1, 36 and 59. However, Lam is silent on the capability of showing that the code generator could generate the challenge. On the other hand, Reed III teaches the generation of the challenge as shown in Figure 2 of Reed III for directing the creation of a shared secret data field and the verification of same data field (column 6, lines 37-67 of Reed III). This limitation is further met on column 1, lines 51-67 through column 2,

Art Unit: 2135

lines 1-3 and lines 34-40 of Reed III. Thus, the combination of teaching between Lam and Reed III is proper and efficient. Hence the combination of teaching between Lam and Reed III teaches the claimed subject matter.

III. Regarding to the Appellant's arguments that the rejections of claims 8-9, 12, 27-28, 43-44, 47, and 66-67 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) were improper because Lam, Reeds, and Chen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention when the invention as claimed in claims 8-9, 12, 27-28, 43-44, 47, and 66-67 is viewed as a whole.

According to the above response to argument, Lam teaches the claimed subject matter of claims 1, 36 and 59; and the combination of teaching between Lam and Reed III teaches the claimed subject matter. However, Lam and Reed III are silent on the capability of revoking and/or recovering public key in its verification process. On the other hand, Chen teaches the server public key is used to encrypt a client-generated portion of the shared secret key, and the encrypted client-generated key is sent to the server where it is recovered using a private key held by the server and combined with a server generated portion of the shared secret key to form the shared secret key (see abstract of Chen). Thus, the combination of teaching between Lam, Reed III, and Chen is proper and efficient. Hence the combination of teaching between Lam, Reed III, and Chen teaches the claimed subject matter.


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Respectfully submitted,




Thanhnga (Tanya) B. Truong 
August 24, 2006

Art Unit: 2135

Conferees:

Gilberto Barron

Matthew Smithers



GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100